FAMILIAR DIALOGUES

BETWEEN

Americus and *Britannicus*;

IN WHICH

The RIGHT of PRIVATE JUDGMENT; the exploded Doctrines of INFALLIBILITY, PASSIVE OBEDIENCE, and NON-RESISTANCE;

WITH

The leading Sentiments of Dr. PRICE, on the Nature of CIVIL LIBERTY, &c.

ARE PARTICULARLY CONSIDERED.

BY JOHN MARTIN.

Ye ſhall be as Gods.——GEN. iii. 5.

LONDON:

Printed for J. WILKIE, in St. Paul's Church-Yard; and J. MATTHEWS, in the Strand.

M.DCC.LXXVI.

[Price One Shilling.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

THERE are few, if any, objections, proposed by Americus *to* Britannicus *in the following Dialogues, which have not been made to the* Author, *by some who apprehended him to be the writer of a paper called* The Monitor. *He hopes therefore, having attempted to answer their objections in this manner, they will excuse him from taking any farther notice of the letters he has received, which have respect to that paper.*

WHILE, *to avoid endless altercation in a more private way, he thus resolved to give a general answer to those who from different principles and different motives opposed him,* Dr. Price's *pamphlet on the Nature of Civil Liberty, fell into his hands. The* Doctor *being a* Dissenting Minister, *and his pamphlet on that account, the more likely to be regarded by some of that numerous and respectable body of people, of which body it is known that the* Author *of these Dialogues is one, he thought it his duty* * *to make the following remarks on the leading sentiments of that popular pamphlet; as he*

* Titus iii. 1.

appre-

apprehended thoſe ſentiments, if embraced, would be productive of miſchievous effects among mankind in general, and Proteſtant Diſſenters in particular.

WHETHER *the Author of theſe Dialogues be miſtaken, or whether the ſecond Dialogue contains an* antidote *againſt* any *of thoſe ſentiments advanced by* Dr. Price, *which are not more* pleaſing *than they are* pernicious, *the Public muſt judge. To them, with all due reſpect, the* Author *ventures to appeal.*

Note, The quotations which are made from *Dr. Price*'s Obſervations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, are made from the third edition of that pamphlet; and the paſſages quoted are referred to by giving the number of the page from whence they are taken, without repeating the title of the book.

DIA-

FAMILIAR DIALOGUES.

INTRODUCTION.

"FRIENDSHIP, ſaid *Seneca* the philoſopher, is the cordial drop in the cup of life;"—and is therefore truly deſirable. But though it ſweetens the bitter cup, that is all the cordial *drop* can do. The wormwood and the gall are taſted ſtill. Nor can we wonder at this, when we conſider the imperfect ſtate of human friendſhip, or how many are the blemiſhes which, in this world, caſt a ſhade on the brighteſt character. Theſe imperfections are neither overlooked nor approved by our beſt friends. They do not indeed view them with that low malignant pleaſure that ſome do, nor yet with that ignorant or affected amazement, to which others are addicted. He who, obſerving common and almoſt

unavoidable infirmities, delights to magnify them to the utmoſt, and who is perpetually exclaiming, "Who could have thought it?" exhibits a more contemptible character in his own, than in that which he attempts to injure and condemn. We ſhould remember, that even ſincere and benevolent intentions, are not always accompanied either with that knowledge, or with that temper which are deſirable. This is no-where more evident, than in matters of diſputation. Friendly conteſts are frequent. They are neceſſary and uſeful. Yet, where is the friend, who on ſerious reflection has not occaſion to own, he has diſcovered more pleaſantry and poignancy in debating on moſt ſubjects, than were of any uſe to them, or of any honor to himſelf? *Americus* and *Britanicus* were not of that number. They were friends; ſincere friends; their friendſhip was founded in knowledge and eſteem; it was pleaſing, it was uſeful, it was laſting: nevertheleſs, it was imperfect. The reader, perhaps, will want no further proof of its imperfection, than what is contained in the following dialogues. However, the author being ſatisfied, they contain a ſeaſonable check on the lawleſs liberty of the day, and humbly hoping, in that view, they may to ſome be acceptable, and to others uſeful, he ventures to preſent them to the public without any further apology.

DĪA-

DIALOGUE I.

THE buſineſs of the day was diſpatched, when *Britanicus* expected his friend. Being alone, and in hope of enjoying ſuch converſation as might be pleaſing and profitable, he thought him long. While *Britanicus* was ruminating on the ſuppoſed cauſe of his preſent diſappointment, *Americus* is heard at the door. He is no ſooner introduced, and the common and mutual endearments of friendſhip are ſubſided, than he ſeems anxious to introduce a ſubject which deeply engroſſed his attention. I know, ſaid he, my friend will forgive me, if I introduce a ſubject at his houſe which at preſent affects me too much to conceal. You muſt know, continued *Americus*, that juſt as I was coming to your houſe, a paper was put into my hand called *The Monitor* *. It was ſaid to be written by a friend of yours, who it ſeems is a Diſſenting Miniſter. This excited my curioſity to read it; and is the true cauſe why I was rather later than expected. I much repent at preſent,

* There are a few of the firſt number of *The Monitor* left in the hands of the bookſellers who ſell this pamphlet.

Britanicus, my fatal curioſity. I call it fatal, becauſe I feel my peace diſturbed; and becauſe I fear it may be the occaſion of diverting our thoughts to a ſubject, on which, though we have agreed to differ, I am afraid we cannot converſe upon it, with all that caution and temper which is deſirable. However, as things are circumſtanced this evening, I hope my friend will forgive me in thus introducing a ſubject he ſo little expected.

INDEED, *Americus*, I can hardly forgive you. In public company, one cannot, continued *Britanicus*, always avoid it; but at my own houſe, I wiſh and expect to be edified by my friends who honor me with their company; and deſire to be more careful than ever leſt I inadvertently introduce any thing which ſhould prevent it. I approve and wiſh to imitate your conduct, ſaid the *modern Patriot*, but I am too deeply wounded at preſent, to be ſilent. Is the author of the paper which I have mentioned, a friend of yours? Is he a Diſſenting Miniſter? *Britanicus* anſwering in the affirmative, *Americus* ſaid, I am really ſorry for him. This imprudent publication will certainly hurt his uſefulneſs. I hear it has offended ſeveral of his beſt friends already: and I aſſure you, Sir, it is likely to affect his temporal intereſt, and conſiderably injure his family.

POOR man! replied *Britanicus*, what a miſerable plight is he in! His uſefulneſs in danger of being

ing deſtroyed; his beſt friends offended; his temporal intereſt, and the affairs of his family, in a very precarious ſituation! But tell me, Sir, is it any particular part of this paper which is ſo offenſive, or is the whole of it condemned? I don't hear of any, ſaid *Americus*, who condemn it wholly; yet I find many are diſpleaſed with ſome peculiar ſtrokes, which I think had been much better omitted.

You remind me, *Americus*, of what I heard the other day. A gentleman, who loves to read men as well as books, being in company with an affectionate mother, who had juſt read the paper which you condemn, ſhe told him, ſhe much approved of the ſubject in general, and ſincerely wiſhed that ſchool-boys, apprentices, ſervants and maſters, would regard the ſeaſonable obſervations; but, with a very different tone of voice, ſhe added to my friend, Don't you think, Sir, that the author is too ſevere on dear little infants? He knows but little, continued ſhe, of the tender feelings of a parent. Some batchelor, I ſuppoſe, Sir; when he is married, it is to be hoped he will have more compaſſion. Her eldeſt ſon, *Maſter Pert*, happened to be in the room when his *Mama* gave this lecture. He took up the paper which lay on the table, and the character of the ſchool-boy at once caught his attention, and met with his hearty diſapprobation. His reſentment againſt

the pen which he thought expoſed and reproved him, was for a few minutes diverted by his attending to the following character. He thought that it contained ſuch a deſcription of *Tom Trifler* behind the counter, that he would readily own it was intended for his picture. Poſſeſſed of this idea, and pleaſed with an opportunity of provoking *poor Tom*, he runs into the ſhop, and preſents him with the mortifying paragraph. Well *Thomas*, cried *Maſter Pert*, don't you think that was intended for your picture? The truth was, *Thomas* paid much greater attention to the preceding character, than he did to his own; therefore he archly replied, I am ſure, *Maſter Billy*, if the character of the apprentice was not deſigned for *my* picture, that of the ſchool-boy was certainly deſigned for *yours*.—But, (to contract an unpleaſing tale) ſuffice it to ſay, that if the gentleman who told me this ſtory may be credited, every one who ſaw their own features were offended with the *Mirror* and the *Monitor*, while the ſchool-boy, the apprentice, the maſter and the miniſter, who adorned their reſpective characters, ſaw nothing in thoſe deſcriptions ſo offenſive to others, which they wiſhed to have eraſed, or concealed from public inſpection.

I THANK you, Sir, ſaid *Americus*, for your tale; and at this time, I thank you too for contracting it; for though there be ſome things in it worthy

worthy of notice, yet I meant to tell you, it is not ſo much thoſe peculiar ſtrokes which reſpect private characters that are ſo offenſive in this paper, as its general deſign. What is that, ſaid *Britanicus?* It is, no doubt, replied the *Patriot*, to repreſent the Americans in a ſtate of actual and cauſeleſs rebellion: and to inſinuate, that many on this ſide the water applaud their conduct. *Britanicus* obſerved, whether that was the deſign of the author of the *Monitor* or no, it was evident to him, that if the Americans were in a ſtate of actual rebellion, it muſt be without any juſt cauſe: for, ſaid he, there never was nor can be any *juſt* cauſe for the *exiſtence* or *continuance* of rebellion either to God or man. I own there may be for the exiſtence of what is *falſly* called rebellion, but never for that which is *really* ſo. For a becoming and manly remonſtrance, for a real * and unavoidable revolution the cauſe may be as juſt as the advocates for ſuch meaſures have been wiſe and the effects glorious: but if you will not diſtinguiſh between thoſe things which eſſentially differ, I do, and I hope I ever ſhall.— Let me add, that many on this ſide the water applaud the conduct of our American brethren,

* By the Revolution which happened in 1688, we do not mean a change *only* in the government of the ſtate, but we mean by it, *that memorable change* which brought us back from the *real* attempts of *James the Second* to enſlave the nation, to thoſe rights and privileges we enjoyed before; and which, if it be not our own fault, we may ſtill enjoy in the more equitable reign of *George the Third.*

ſuppoſing it to be wiſe and virtuous, who can doubt, even if he knows no more of the matter than what he may learn from our public papers, and from thoſe indecent and injurious productions which almoſt daily teem from the preſs?

CONSIDER, my dear Sir, ſaid *Americus*, to charge ſo many brave men, with being in a ſtate of rebellion, is very dreadful. I grant it, ſaid *Britanicus*; but if it be a dreadful charge, what makes it ſo? Its being *evidently* matter of *fact*: if it were not ſo, ſuch a charge will do them no more harm in the end, than the groundleſs charges they have exhibited againſt the parent ſtate. However, far be it from me, an obſcure individual, to determine what number of the Americans are guilty of ſo flagrant a crime. I am willing to hope, the real number of ſuch is not ſo conſiderable as many apprehend. As to *brave* men, there are none who are guilty of rebellion. For, true bravery and actual rebellion are as inconſiſtent as *virtue* and *vice*. A rebel may be *bold*, but as ſuch, he cannot be *brave*. But let us leave this to better judges. If you have any further remarks or objections to make on my friend's paper, which it ſeems has ſo much diſturbed you, produce them; and I will attempt, at leaſt, to give you ſatisfaction.

THE ſentiments which are ſo obnoxious to me, ſaid *Americus*, in that paper, are, thoſe which are known

known by the odious names of *infallibility*, *paſſive obedience*, and *non-reſiſtance*; and I am ſorry to find that any friend of yours ſhould attempt to ſupport them. But are you ſure that this is the caſe? ſaid *Britanicus*. *Americus* ſaid he was: he propoſed to prove his aſſertions ſeparately, and to begin with the doctrine of *infallibility*. Whom then, ſaid *Britanicus*, do you apprehend the author of the Monitor conſiders as infallible? The king? the parliament? or himſelf? Himſelf! no, *Britanicus*; your friend can never be ſo vain. His imperfections are too conſpicuous to be overlooked; and I would hope, of too glaring a nature to be admired. But it is evident to me, that he conſiders the king and parliament as infallible.—But what proof do you produce to ſupport this charge. Why, ſaid *Americus*, his own words. As if your friend had received his education in a conclave of cardinals, thus he ſpeaks. "The authority of a nation can never be illegal "when the executive power only enforces what "the ſuperior power enacts." So you ſee, Sir, they can never do any thing that is wrong; and if ſo, they are to be ſure infallible. I find, ſaid *Britanicus*, that this is your comment on my friend's text; a comment which obſcures, nay, which perverts the ſenſe. 'Tis ſome time ſince I read the paſſage, and therefore I dare not be poſitive; but I can't help thinking that, the quotation itſelf is unfair.—Read, and be convinced then, ſaid *Americus*: you will find what I

have repeated almoſt at the cloſe of the 15th page.

BRITANICUS, on conſulting the paſſage to which his friend had directed him, ſaid, I find the words you have repeated, but at the ſame time, I find others which (inadvertently I ſuppoſe) you have omitted. The whole reads thus: "The authority of a nation can never be illegal, "according to human laws, when the executive "power only enforces what the ſuperior power "enacts." You ſee, my good friend, he does not ſay that whatever thoſe combined powers enact and execute can never be *unwiſe*, *oppreſſive*, or *unjuſt*: no, the aſſertion is, that, *according to human laws*, whatever they enact and execute cannot be *illegal*. If you ſay it may, I anſwer, that is in my opinion, to break down at once the line of diſtinction between *legal* and *uſurped* authority, and to open the wideſt door to anarchy and confuſion. You allow then, ſaid *Americus*, that a king and parliament may err; that it is poſſible at leaſt, they may make and execute ſuch acts as are unwiſe, oppreſſive and unjuſt? *Britanicus* freely allowed this; and ſaid, the author of the Monitor was of the ſame opinion. That author, he obſerved, has granted that, what he calls legal authority, through human weakneſs, may err, and lend her ſanction to ſomething which is impolitic. Nay, he ſuppoſes, there may be a period when that which aſſumes the *name* of government, may be *illegal*, both with reſpect to its

exiſtence

exiſtence and its *abuſe* of power. Such mournful periods, during our *civil diſſentions*, our *interregnums*, and in the time of what was ſpeciouſly called, *The Common-wealth of England*, are eaſily recollected; and the preſent view of the ſame affecting ſcene in *America*, will not be ſoon forgot.

I THANK you, I ſincerely thank you, ſaid *Americus*, for the candid and pleaſing conceſſions you have now made. They are more than I expected. You now embolden me to aſk what I hope will prove, a deciſive queſtion. I aſk then, when ſuch wicked and oppreſſive acts as you have mentioned do exiſt, though it be under the ſanction of government, ought they not to be immediately reſiſted? Are we then, replied *Britanicus*, to make a ſudden tranſition from the doctrine of infallibility, to thoſe inſeparably connected with it? Do you now apprehend, that my friend who wrote the Monitor, and myſelf, are *ſound* catholics in the leading article of their creed, and that you ſhall have little or no difficulty to prove us ſo with reſpect to paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance? *Americus*, aſſured his friend, that at preſent he was far from drawing ſuch an inference from what had paſſed. I am ſatisfied, ſaid he, that you and your friend are not ſuch advocates for the doctrine of infallibility as at firſt I raſhly ſuppoſed. Your late conceſſion has relieved my mind. I am impatient for your anſwer to my queſtion, in hope that it will prove

deciſive;

deciſive; and that I ſhall learn from it, you no more approve of the exploded doctrines of paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance to a fellow worm, than you apprehend any man, or any ſet of men, to be infallible. I therefore repeat the queſtion, When ſuch wicked and oppreſſive acts really do exiſt, ought they not to be immediately reſiſted? *Britanicus* obſerved, that this queſtion was not likely to be ſo deciſive, or the anſwer to be ſo ſatisfactory as his friend had ſuppoſed. However, continued he, a previous queſtion appears abſolutely neceſſary. What is that? cried *Americus*. The queſtion which I think ſhould be put previous to yours, replied *Britanicus*, is this, Who are to judge whether any act which has the genuine ſtamp of legal authority, be unwiſe, oppreſſive or unjuſt? Who! (fired with political rage) Who are to judge in this matter? Why, every man, ſaid *Americus*, is to judge for himſelf. The right of private judgment, continued the animated *Patriot*, the right of private judgment, Sir, is inalienable. It cannot be transferred to another; nor ought it to be ſuppreſſed by any power on earth. It is of heavenly original. Heaven will protect it, and frown upon thoſe puſilanimous mortals who do not, or who dare not exerciſe it. The right of private judgment is beyond a doubt, Sir, the native right of every peaſant in GREAT-BRITAIN: why do I ſay GREAT-BRITAIN? when I might at once have ſaid, THE GREAT GLOBE ITSELF! In this reſpect, the prince

and

and the peaſant are on equal terms. And, I was going to add, he cannot be a friend to philoſophy or divinity who would knowingly attempt to deprive the meaneſt individual of his native right.

I SUPPOSE, ſaid *Britanicus*, accompanied with an expreſſive ſmile at the folly of his friend, I ſuppoſe, ſaid he, had you made this laudable ſpeech in a circle of your patriotic friends, it would have been followed with the pleaſing eclats of applauſe, if in their ardour they had been reſtrained from ſaying *encore!* Surely, Sir, you muſt have ſat at the feet of our immortal *Locke*, and the incomparable *Monteſquieu*, with vaſt attention. You ſeem to have riſen to the ſecond claſs at leaſt, in the ſchool of — — — liberty, I think you call it; and to ſuppoſe, that neither philoſophy or divinity can flouriſh elſewhere. However, ere I am admitted a diſciple into this noiſy ſchool, and have the honour to be under the tuition of thoſe great men whom I have juſt now mentioned, reſpecting ſome of their refinements on the ſubject of civil liberty, give me leave to aſk, whether they or you admit of any diſtinction between private and public judgment? Well, Sir, if you do not approve of this puzzling queſtion, (which by your ſilence, and other circumſtances, it appears you do not) we will change it for another. I aſk then, in plain terms, What do you mean by private judgment? Do you mean by it no more than this, namely, That

it is the duty, as well as the native right of every man, to judge of perſons and things according to the evidence before him, and the abilities which he poſſeſſes? If this be all, where is the *fool* who denies it? Where is the *foe* who can poſſibly prevent it? The right of private judgment, in this view of it, is as ſecure, and conſequently as laſting, as thought and reflection; for while they exiſt and are exerciſed, that cannot be violated. But, if by this favourite, this hackneyed phraſe, you mean, that we ought in all things to be governed by our private judgment; if you mean, that all men have an indiſputable right to expreſs their private judgment of men and meaſures in whatever terms they pleaſe, and that they have an equal right to enforce it in ſuch a manner as they ſhall approve; then you are contending for that which, though (what is called) fine ſenſe may admire, common ſenſe will never grant. The wiſeſt of men are the moſt jealous of themſelves; and of all men, the moſt diffident of their own judgment. They are ever more ready to ſhew their opinion, and to ſubmit to better judges, than they are to dictate to others in doubtful matters, and to exalt themſelves. On the contrary, the moſt ſenſible enthuſiaſt for what he calls civil liberty, is not aſhamed to aſſert, that *ſelf-direction* and *ſelf-government* are, in fact, ALL IN ALL! What ſay you, *Americus*, are you pleading only for what is not denied you; I mean the inconteſtable right of

judging for yourſelf, and ſubmitting your private judgment in a reſpectful manner to the public? Or are you pleading for that which reaſon and common-ſenſe will never grant you; I mean, the ſuppoſed right of every man's expreſſing and enforcing his private judgment *when*, *where*, and *how* he pleaſes?

Americus laboured to ſuppreſs his feelings in vain. Diſappointment, with a train of uneaſy paſſions which uſually attend her, tortured his breaſt; and the painful ſenſations which they produced, were, for a few moments, too viſible in his face. To ſay, he only contended for the right of private judgment in the limited ſenſe of that phraſe, was ſaying nothing to the purpoſe: nay, it was in effect ſaying, *I am miſtaken*; *I am aſhamed*. The thought of this, ſhocked his pride, and made him ſilent. To ſay, he contended for this chimerical right, in that unlimited and unguarded manner that ſome do, this was ſaying what he could not approve; though as a diſputant he was tempted to grant it. If the thoughts of the former anſwer ſhocked his *pride*, this affected his *conſcience*. He ſat a while in painful ſuſpenſe. At laſt, hardly knowing what he ſaid, he replied, Suppoſe, *Britanicus*, I was an advocate for the right of private judgment in the fulleſt ſenſe of that pleaſing phraſe, what have you to object againſt it? Nothing at all, ſaid *Britanicus*. I don't make any objection againſt the phraſe, neither

in

in ſound nor ſenſe. But what I object to is, its being perverted to ſubſerve pernicious purpoſes. *Pernicious purpoſes* indeed! for what can be called ſo, *Americus*, if thoſe be not which ſome would eſtabliſh under pretence of pleading for the ſacred right of private judgment? What they contend for in reality is, *That every man may do what is right in his* own *eyes.* This, in the opinion of ſome, is the perfection of civil liberty. Eſtabliſh this principle, and our conſtitution would differ as much as our complexions. Eſtabliſh this principle, and you make every man a monarch; every ſtupid creature a ſtateſman; every illiterate and illicit perſon a lawgiver; and every avaracious and audacious wretch his own avenger! Eſtabliſh this favourite tenet, *Americus*, and though perſons who eſpouſe it, ſhould pretend to have a *profound* reſpect for the king, and almoſt to *idolize* the conſtitution; yet by one fatal blow, right and wrong, law and equity, reaſon and revelation, are no more! I ſay no more; for what, Sir, are fine ſounding names, when the things which they repreſent have no real exiſtence? This, Sir, is not all. Eſtabliſh the *Diana* that ſome reſtleſs, noiſy mortals attempt to vindicate and magnify almoſt inceſſantly, and what will follow? Why this ſeeming contradiction. Our native pride would be highly *gratified*, and yet, in the end, as wretchedly *diſappointed. Diſappointed!* ſaid *Americus.* Yes, ſtill diſappointed, ſaid his friend; for the levelling blow which diſ-

graces

graces our ſuperiors, would exalt our inferiors; and pride would not be more gratified with the former, than ſhe would be vexed and diſappointed with the latter.

AMERICUS ſeemed more attentively calm than his friend expected. *Britannicus* waited for his remarks; but obſerving he was not at preſent diſpoſed to make a reply, *Britannicus* proceeded.

I GRANTED you, Sir, a few minutes ago, that neither kings nor parliaments are infallible — that the latter had enacted, and the former enforced (through human weakneſs) ſuch acts as were oppreſſive and unjuſt: the repeal of ſome acts in former reigns, is an evidence that ſuch weakneſs once exiſted; and that when convinced of it, they were willing to own it, and to correct it.— Knowing that human nature is ſtill in the ſame imperfect ſtate, I have freely granted, that it is poſſible they may err in like manner again.— Whenever they do, you aſk me, Is it not the duty of every honeſt man to reſiſt them?—I reply, a previous queſtion is neceſſary, and ſtate it.—On demanding who are to judge of the true nature and real tendency of legal acts — you tell me, every man; and contend for the right of private judgment in a manner which, I think, excludes an humble and becoming ſubmiſſion in individuals; which introduces an haughty ſelf-ſufficiency, accompanied with contempt of our

ſuperiors; (nay, with denying that we have any) and which ſpreads confuſion wherever the ſentiment prevails. To convince you of this, let us ſuppoſe, that great numbers of them, whom you call the diſcerning, impartial public, have never read any of thoſe acts which have given offence to our brethren in *America*; let us ſuppoſe, that ſome thouſands of this vaſt body (which ſome have repreſented as all eye) are abſolutely incapable of underſtanding them, having neither capacity, leiſure, nor inclination properly to attend to ſuch ſubjects *. Let us ſuppoſe too for once, that many who do not want capacity, are ſo prejudiced on different accounts againſt the government which protects them, or with thoſe officers of ſtate it is their pleaſure or profit to oppoſe, that in ſuch circumſtances, they will not give truth a fair hearing; let us farther ſuppoſe, that when theſe deductions are made, that of the remaining number of the body politic, there is a conſiderable and truly reſpectable majority within doors and without, who approve of thoſe acts which ſome apprehend are oppreſſive and unjuſt; and, (which I had liked to forgot) let us alſo ſuppoſe, that ſuch a majority have as inconteſtable a right to eſtabliſh their private judgment, as the motley minority who oppoſe them. In ſuch circumſtances, Sir, what is duty? what is reaſonable? what is right? Muſt every one do juſt

* See Dialogue II.

what

what is right in his own eyes, on pretence, that if he does not, ſelf-government will be deſtroyed, and ſlavery eſtabliſhed? Muſt the majority I have mentioned, which includes the three eſtates of the kingdom, ſupported alſo by the greater part of them who are repreſented by the Commons; muſt theſe, all theſe, ſubmit to a minority who oppoſe them? or (if there be any room for ſubmiſſion where ſelf is ſo much exalted) ſhould not the minority willingly *ſubmit* to *ſuch* a majority? I don't ſay they ſhould *approve* of any thing done by any majority, without conviction of their acting a part which is worthy their approbation; but, as fellow-ſubjects and members of the ſame ſociety, ſubmiſſion in ſuch circumſtances, appears to me their honor and their duty.

I HAVE liſtened with attention, ſaid *Americus*, to your well-meant harangue; but I muſt own, *Britannicus*, I have not yet obtained ſatisfaction. If you argue from numbers, you may prove what you pleaſe, and introduce all that is injurious both in church and ſtate. Papiſts and Pagans argue in this manner: they reſpectively and frequently ſay, We have the majority on our ſide, while they who oppoſe us, in many places, are but few and inconſiderable. My dear Sir, replied *Britannicus*, you miſtake me: my argument is not drawn from names and numbers *only*, but from an unexceptionable rule. The rule which I have in view is

this: That it is the duty of perſons who are *voluntarily* connected together in civil ſociety, to ſubmit to the leading members of that ſociety whenever they are joined by a reſpectable majority of the whole: always ſuppoſing, that the deciſions of ſuch a majority do not interfere with the real and ſacred rights of conſcience, in any part of our duty towards God. If this equitable and ancient rule be treated with contempt, I am afraid we ſhall ſoon be too much like the lawleſs banditti of ſharpers and ſmugglers who live without one; (except you will ſay they act under the influence of ſelf-government, and their own private judgment) or elſe, departing from the unexceptionable rule juſt now mentioned, I fear, one which is as *feeble* as it is *fooliſh* will be introduced in its ſtead. I venture to call this rule *unexceptionable*, becauſe a particular friend of yours, if I be not miſtaken, cordially approves of it; I mean, *Americanus* *. He ſays, "As though "every man did not know, that in all collective "bodies, the determinations of the *majority* of "that body are always conſidered as the deter-"minations of the *whole body*; and that every "man who enters into ſociety, implicitly *conſents* "that it ſhould be ſo." You well remember, Sir, that this gentleman is ſpeaking of the approved conduct of the Houſe of Commons; and

* See a Letter to the Rev. Mr. *John Weſley*, by *Americanus*, 2d edit. page 8.

I ſhall not ſoon forget, that this unguarded ſpeech, does in effect refute all he has ſaid againſt ſome of the acts lately paſſed by that venerable houſe. For, if in all collective bodies the determinations of the majority of each body *are*, and *ought* to be conſidered as the determinations of the whole body, either the late acts which *Americanus* ſo much diſapproves of were paſſed without a majority, or he and his favorite, who repreſents him *, *implicitly conſent* to each of them: and if ſo, why all this oppoſition to their execution?

THE *patriot* obſerved, that if *Americanus* were preſent, he would probably ſay, " Though I " conſider the determinations of the majority as " the determinations of the whole body, yet not " in a houſe where corrupt and venal members " are ſo numerous." For my part, replied *Britannicus*, I have too good an opinion of the modeſty and virtue of your friend, than to ſuppoſe he would ſeek for ſhelter in ſuch a ſubterfuge. In my opinion, he who could be contented with ſuch a reflection on a houſe which demands our reſpect, might as well ſay, without any artifice at all, " Though I grant that in all collective " bodies, the voice of the majority ſhould be " conſidered as the voice of the whole, yet my " true and real meaning is, that it be limited to

* Mr. Burke.

a majority of my own chooſing; or, which is the ſame thing, that it be a majority of ſuch members as I cordially approve *.—Let me add,

* Since I wrote the above, the Rev. Mr. *Caleb Evans* of *Briſtol*, M. A. has publiſhed a Reply to the Rev. Mr. *Fletcher*'s Vindication of Mr. *Weſley*'s Calm Addreſs to our *American* Colonies; in which, he owns himſelf to be the author of a pamphlet lately publiſhed under the ſignature of *Americanus*; and takes ſome notice of the paſſage I have quoted. In anſwer to the Rev. Mr. *Fletcher*'s remark on this paſſage (in page 31, 32), he ſays, "*Becauſe* every collective body muſt neceſſarily ſubmit "to the determinations of the *majority* of that body, to which "they belong; therefore the *Americans* ought to ſubmit to "the taxation of the *Britiſh* parliament, though they do "not belong to that body, and have not a ſingle voice in "the election of any one perſon that does."——I ſhall only obſerve, on Mr. *Evans*'s evaſive reply, if the *Americans* do not belong to that body, how are we to account for their affecting petition to them, "when they claimed their aid "and protection againſt a SINGLE colony ‡?" how are we to account for their thanks for favours received from that body, or their ſolemn profeſſions of being *loyal* ſubjects and *dutiful* children, if at laſt they do not belong to that body? —As to their not having a ſingle voice in the election of any perſon belonging to that body, it is not our fault if they have not; nor do they conſider this as matter of *real* grievance, though it is ſo often mentioned, for want, I preſume, of better argument. It is their *local* diſtance, and not the *law* of *England*, that prevents the *American*'s having a voice at elections, and a ſeat in the parliament houſe. And after all, are there no *Americans* who are members of that body? Has ſhe no friends ſhe can truſt in the Houſe of Commons? If ſhe has, why all theſe groundleſs complaints? If ſhe has not, why ſuch vain boaſts that orators and patriots, men of property and honor, from principles of intereſt and conviction, ſtand forth within thoſe walls to plead her cauſe?

‡ See *The Rights of Great-Britain aſſerted*, page 13.

though

though it be criminal in the higheſt degree for the king, directly or indirectly to procure a majority of ſuch members in the Houſe as recommend themſelves to his majeſty's private judgment; yet, what is ſo *criminal* in him, is matter of *conſcience* in others, and merits the higheſt applauſe. But why is that which is ſo wrong in his majeſty, not only right, but laudable in his people? Becauſe it is more to the king's real and laſting intereſt to ruin the nation than any of his ſubjects? Far from it! Becauſe, he is a malicious prince, and would rejoice in our ruin, though he foreſaw how much it would affect his own intereſt and honor? Surely, not a man in GREAT-BRITAIN believes the ſlander. Are we then to conclude, it is becauſe he is an ignorant prince, who is not half ſo well acquainted with our excellent conſtitution and preſent circumſtances, as the various *Quidnuncs* of the day? It puts common modeſty to the bluſh to aſk the queſtion. What ſhall we ſay then? Is it becauſe he was *made* a king by his people, who were all *born* kings without him, and who in reality are ſuperior to him? If none of theſe *curious* and *criminal* conjectures will ſolve the doubt, can you inform me, *Americus*, how I may obtain ſatisfaction?

BUT raillery apart, *Britannicus*, you don't mean to deny, I hope, replied the *Patriot*, that there are corrupt and venal members in the honorable Houſe of Commons? No, ſaid *Britannicus*, I

neither mean at preſent to deny it, or to aſſert it: much leſs do I mean to determine who they are, and leaſt of all to triumph in the ſuppoſed diſcovery. But, I mean to aſk you, ſuppoſing ſuch diſhonorable members diſgrace thoſe walls, how they came there? I am rather ſurprized, ſaid *Americus*, you ſhould aſk me ſuch a queſtion. One would be almoſt ready to imagine, that you never heard of *Punch*'s exhibition. And may I not in my turn as naturally ſuppoſe, ſaid *Britannicus*, that my friend never ſaw a *puppet ſhow?* Ah! Sir, in vain may *Punch* exhibit his peculiar feats, in vain with facetious ſpeeches, expreſſive looks, and almoſt ſpeaking geſtures, addreſs the ſtaring and aſtoniſhed crowd; in vain, I ſay, are all his tricks before or behind the ſcenes, when *fools* and *knaves* are not preſent to admire them. Were none of the public meanly avaricious, *corruption* and *bribery* would be hiſſed off from the ſtage with deſerved contempt. However, it gives me great pleaſure that I can add, that what is too often applauded in the country, is *now* condemned at court: and in this view of it, though corruption and bribery yet exiſt, I may truly ſay, they never exiſted in ſuch diſgrace, or were ſo chaſtiſed as in the *preſent* reign.

Well, I believe, *Britannicus*, you and I muſt ſtill agree to differ on this ſubject. And, as it is now too late to enter on any other this evening, only indulge me by giving me your thoughts more

more particularly, on paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance, and I will not any longer treſpaſs on your time and patience. You ſtill apprehend, *Americus*, I ſuppoſe, that the author of the Monitor is an advocate for each of theſe exploded doctrines. *Americus* ſaid, he did. *Britannicus* aſked him, on what ground. Why, ſaid he, I have informed you on what ground already. That author plainly tells you, that whatever the parliament enacts and the king confirms cannot be illegal; from which it is eaſy to infer, that he ſuppoſes paſſive obedience and non-reſiſtance is our duty. I confeſs, ſaid *Britannicus*, it is *eaſy* enough to infer this, but taking in the whole of what is ſaid by my friend, is it *juſt?* Juſt or unjuſt, however, he is not only called to your bar, but is already condemned it ſeems, as a political heretic! As there uſually is but a ſmall interval between the condemnation and execution of ſuch an heretic, let me intreat you, Sir, though he be condemned without *proof*, that he may not (if it be poſſible to impart it) die without *conviction*. I beg, therefore, you will tell me plainly, what you mean by *paſſive obedience*; that if indeed it ſhould appear, my friend has maintained any thing which ſhould prevent his departing in peace, I may by your aſſiſtance convince him of his error, and prevail with him to ſign his recantation. If you, *Britannicus*, can make him as ſenſible of his miſtakes as I am of your raillery, he will then be in the very ſituation I wiſh to ſee him. But, ſaid *Americus*, to be ſerious: By

paſſive

paſſive obedience, I mean, " A tame ſubmiſſion " to thoſe whom you *call* our ſuperiors, not " knowing why we obey them." Methinks I ſee, *Americus*, by your anſwer, what is the *core* of the preſent controverſy. The fact is, the idea of ſuperiors is diſguſting; and obedience *itſelf*, I find, is irkſome; therefore, the firſt is called in queſtion, and the laſt is brought into contempt by calling it (when you pleaſe) *paſſive*. Otherwiſe, I might obſerve, that our ſuperiors no doubt prefer *cheerful* obedience to a tame and ignorant ſubmiſſion, and if we are not poſſeſſed of ſo much knowledge as to inform us *what* is duty, and *wherefore* our ſuperiors are to be obeyed (while their commands are conſiſtent with the characters they ſuſtain, and do not exceed the limits before mentioned), who is diſgraced by ſuch wilful ignorance, *they?* or *we?*

I AM convinced that many of our modern patriots, who cannot brook a ſuperior, nor approve of ſubjection when it is their duty to be obedient, have nothing to object againſt paſſive obedience as you call it, when they uſurp authority themſelves, and are permitted to dictate and command. There are recent, numerous and awful inſtances of this in AMERICA; where, if all could obtain liberty and protection, who are now compelled to ſubmit to their furious leaders, I verily believe, no foreign troops need have been employed to reduce the reſt to order and peace. Give me leave to add, that if it be ſo inglorious

paſſively

paſſively to obey our ſuperiors, and tamely and ignorantly to ſubmit to the legiſlative authority of the kingdom, what muſt we think of them who yield a more * *abject* ſubmiſſion to their *equals* and *inferiors?* Or of thoſe, who after having exploded paſſive obedience to others, and reprobated their conduct who yield it, applaud and eſtabliſh it when it is paid to themſelves?—*Republicus*, you know, is a mighty man at Guildhall. There, Sir, I have heard him almoſt anathematize thoſe who ignorantly and tamely ſubmit to *miniſterial* mandates; and yet, in a few minutes, he has as much applauded not only the gentlemen of the livery who ſupported his cauſe, but even all the *mobility* who eſpouſed it, whether they were drunk or ſober; and cordially approved of their *huzzas*, at a time when the *orator* could not be heard; and a hundred times when he knew he was not underſtood. When ſuch *gentry* have bawled out, NO TAXATION! NO TYRANNY! WILKES AND LIBERTY FOR EVER! *Republicus* has appeared elate with pride and almoſt tranſported with the ſordid joy. All who attempted to raiſe or prolong the enchanting ſounds, were not only admitted but admired; while all who diſſented from them, though it was done rationally, and couched in terms of decency and reſpect, were imme-

* ——————————This is ſervitude,
To ſerve th' unwiſe, or him who hath rebell'd
Againſt his worthier, as thine now ſerve thee,
Thy ſelf not free, but to thy ſelf enthrall'd.—
Par. Loſt, B. vi. 178—181.

diately condemned, and in danger not only of being hiſſed and groaned, but of being almoſt trampled to death.

I AM ſorry, *Britannicus*, if any have been too violent in the cauſe of liberty, and I muſt own, ſome have carried things *rather* to an extreme. But, if any have been unhappily inconſiſtent, ſaid *Americus*, they have not, I hope, acted a wicked part. There are no placemen nor penſioners amongſt them. The rights of election, on their ſide, are yet unviolated. They are ſo, replied *Britannicus*, in all the parade of pretenſion and empty boaſt; but who with truth can ſay any more to the honor of ſome on this ſubject? Are there no *domeſtics*, *dependants*, *hirelings*, and *hypocrites*, who have a right to poll in Guildhall? Yet when theſe give, or *ſell* their vote for WRETCHEDNESS and LIBERTY, are they not ſet down as "*Good men and true?*"—There is another view of the ſubject, which now occurs to my mind, in which it will perhaps appear, that even you *yourſelf* have not much to object againſt paſſive obedience. You now have reſpect to family concerns I preſume, ſaid *Americus*. No, replied *Britannicus*, I have not. In the family, parents and maſters expect their children and ſervants to obey them without contradiction, and often without examination. Their juſt authority is ſettled beyond diſpute. It is the *abuſe* of it, againſt which there can be any reaſonable objection. But what I have now in view is, the obedience, or muſt I

call

call it, the *ſubmiſſion* of a king to his ſubjects? What do you mean *Britannicus?* I cannot conceive at preſent to what you allude. I allude, ſaid *Britannicus*, to the conduct of *King John* to his barons, when he ſigned the famous deed called MAGNA CHARTA. His conduct in that inſtance you approve of no doubt. Moſt certainly, ſaid *Americus*, and it is almoſt the only thing which I can approve of in the conduct of that weak and wicked prince. But conſider, my dear Sir, conſider, ſaid *Britannicus*, that what you ſo much approve in *King John*, you ſeem to dread yourſelf, and to deſpiſe in others. For, let me aſk, was not the ſubmiſſion of this weak prince to his barons, that which you call paſſive? Did he not, however, obey them, merely becauſe he had neither opportunity nor courage to reſiſt them? And yet, (unaccountable overſight!) they who ſo much affect to condemn a tame and forced ſubmiſſion, do not ſcruple to ſay, this is almoſt the only commendable thing which appears in all his reign. I ſee, Sir, that paſſive obedience is not in its own nature ſo frightful a monſter even to *Patriots* as they ſometimes repreſent it; but the the truth is, it is either *amiable* or *odious*, as ſome peculiar circumſtances produce a change in its outward appearance. When it coincides with ſelf-government, and ſooths our native pride, it is *glorious:* but when it thwarts our pride, and claims ſubmiſſion from us, though it be to the moſt reſpectable authority, then it is *infamous.*

THOUGH I cannot, ſaid *Americus*, conſiſtently I find, approve of *John*'s ſubmiſſion to his barons, yet I admire the charter, and hope it will be preſerved in full force to our lateſt poſterity. I rather wonder, I muſt confeſs, replied *Britannicus*, that gentlemen of your ſentiments ſhould ſpeak ſo highly of this famous deed. Conſider, Sir, it is a CHARTER, and chartered privileges are not very high in the eſteem of the moſt conſiderable men on your ſide the queſtion *. But this famous deed is not only a charter, but you ſee, it was originally a *forced charter*; and there is ſomething in that, not quite ſo *conſiſtent*, and I ſhould ſuppoſe not quite ſo *pleaſing* to thoſe gentlemen who ſay, they have entirely exploded paſſive obedience. Moreover, it is a *charter* granted by a *monarch*; nay, *yourſelf* being judge, it is a *charter* granted by a *wicked* and *weak* monarch; which muſt be rather mortifying to ſome people, when they conſider that their choiceſt privileges are held by ſuch a tenure. And after all, this very *charter* is *imperfect*, if it be not—— I beg your pardon, *Britannicus*, for interrupting you, but I own, I have no patience to hear you ſay any thing againſt a deed which is juſtly ſo dear to every real friend of our happy conſtitution. *Britannicus*, who rather expected the interruption, calmly replied, If, *Americus*, you will not permit me to ſpeak on this ſubject, I know you will hear *Dr. Goldſmith*; whom you do

* See Dr. Price on the Nature of Civil Liberty, page 32--40.

not

not apprehend will ſay any thing in favour of tyranny and oppreſſion: and yet, *Dr. Goldſmith*, ſpeaking of *Magna Charta*, ſays, "This famous "deed, either granted or ſecured freedom to "thoſe orders of the kingdom that were already "poſſeſſed of freedom, namely, to the clergy, "the barons, and the gentlemen; as for the in-"ferior, and the greateſt part of the people, they, "ſaith the Doctor, were as yet held as ſlaves, and "it was long * before they could come to a par-

"ticipation

* A gentleman, who is a better judge on this ſubject than *Dr. Goldſmith*, and who is deſervedly eſteemed by all who know how much the public are indebted to SIR WILLIAM BLACKSTONE; that truly reſpectable author, in his Commentaries on the Laws of England, has made the following remarks reſpecting *Magna Charta*. "In King John's time, and that "of his ſon Henry the Third, the rigours (ſays the knight) "of the feodal tenures and the foreſt laws were ſo warmly "kept up, that they occaſioned many inſurrections of the "barons or principal feudatories; which at laſt had this "effect, that firſt King John, and afterwards his ſon, con-"ſented to the two famous charters of Engliſh liberties, "*Magna Charta* and *Charta de Foreſta*. Of theſe the latter "was well calculated to redreſs many grievances, and en-"croachments of the crown, in the exertion of the foreſt "law: and the former confirmed many liberties of the "church, and redreſſed many grievances incident to feodal "tenures, of no ſmall moment at that time; though now, "unleſs conſidered attentively and with this retroſpect, they "ſeem but of trifling concern." Book iv. p. 413.—When this accurate writer advances to the reign of Edward the Firſt, in his legal hiſtory, whom he conſiders as our Engliſh Juſtinian, he ſays, "It is from this period, from the exact "obſervation of *Magna Charta*, rather than from its *making*

"or

" ticipation of legal protection." You ſee, *Americus*, I have not gone too far in ſaying that this truly famous deed was imperfect. The civil privileges ſecured to many by this charter, I am thankful for; but, the manner in which it was obtained at *Runimede*, is by no means to be compared with a confirmation of the ſame privileges granted by EDWARD the *Firſt*. In the original grant, we ſee a puſilanimous king ſigning an inſtrument he wiſhed to deſtroy: in the confirmation, we behold " one of the greateſt and boldeſt " princes that ever ſwayed the Engliſh ſceptre,"

" or *renewal*, in the days of his grandfather and father, that " the liberty of Engliſhmen began again to rear its head; " though the weight of the military tenures hung heavy upon " it for many ages after." Book iv. p. 427.—Many ages indeed! for they and many other grievances continued till Charles the Second. " In his reign, ſays the Judge, (wicked, " ſanguinary, and turbulent as it was) the concurrence " of happy circumſtances was ſuch, that from thence we may " date not only the re-eſtabliſhment of our church and mo- " narchy, but alſo the complete reſtitution of Engliſh li- " berty, for the firſt time, ſince its total abolition at the Con- " queſt."—Nay, he affirms, that " the conſtitution of Eng- " land had arrived to its full vigour, and the true ballance " between liberty and prerogative was happily eſtabliſhed " by *law*, in the reign of King Charles the Second." Book iv. p. 438, 439.

I will cloſe this long note by juſt obſerving, That if it be inconteſtible (and the Judge ſays it is) that the people had as large a portion of real liberty as is conſiſtent with a ſtate of ſociety, in the reign of Charles the Second, it is equally *inconteſtible* that no honeſt man need flee to *America* for fear of being made a ſlave in the reign of George the Third.

ratifying

ratifying the reaſonable requeſt. In both we ſee the *good people of England*, practically acknowledging the ſuperiority of their reigning monarch; which was then conſidered as much the glory of of our conſtitution, as it has been ſince ſuppoſed by ſome to be its burden and diſgrace. In a word, (for it is high time to take our leave of *King John* and his reſolute barons) if in every view you oppoſe paſſive obedience, how can you conſiſtently wiſh the preſent parliament to be diſſolved, or, that they without conviction of having done wrong, ſhould repeal their own acts? Do you ſuppoſe they have no thirſt for ſelf-dominion? Or is it reaſonable, that while you who oppoſe them are determined to be governed by your own will, that all who reſiſt you ſhould be denied the ſame privilege? For my part, I am fully convinced, that government and governors are from above, and ordained for our advantage. The perſons however, who reap the greateſt advantage from the government under which they reſide, are thoſe who are willingly, practically and conſcientiouſly ſubject to its juſt demands: and what are its juſt demands is not always in the power of every individual to determine. It is a folly to expect perfection in any ſtate on earth: but in general, we ſhall certainly find, that *ſubjection*, *ſafety* and *ſatisfaction*, are inſeparably united.

We have ſaid ſo much, *Americus*, concerning paſſive obedience, that we have but little occa-

ſion, and indeed we have but little time before us, to take any diſtinct and particular notice of *non-reſiſtance*. At your leiſure, I wiſh you to conſider the ſubject attentively; and afterwards to inform me, *whom* you would have reſiſted? by *whom?* for what *cauſe?* in what *manner?* to what *end* *? and you will probably find at laſt, that I and my friend (the author of the Monitor I mean) are no more anxious to eſtabliſh this, or any other obnoxious ſentiment, in a manner that is injurious to the *natural* or *moral*, *civil* or *religious* liberties of mankind, than *Dr. Price* himſelf.

I AM quite willing, *Britannicus*, to put a period to the preſent conteſt; but ſince you have once more reminded me of your friend, (whom in the hurry of debate, *poor man*, I had almoſt forgot), I hope, when you have another interview with him, you will caution him againſt meddling with things which are out of his own ſphere. Tell him, if you pleaſe, that I wiſh his *firſt* number may be his *laſt*.——Without delivering ſuch a meſſage, I have it now in my power to aſſure you, *Americus*, that what is your wiſh is my friend's determination. But I muſt add, (and I ſuppoſe it is an addition that ſpoils all) though

* In all caſes that have exiſted or can be conceived, I hold that reſiſtance, to be juſtifiable, muſt be directed againſt the uſurpation or undue exerciſe of power; and that it is moſt criminal when directed againſt any power itſelf inherent in the conſtitution."——BURGOYNE.

he does not intend to write another number of the Monitor, yet he informs me, that he and his friends alluded to in the firſt number, are ſtill determined by their pens, their purſes, and their prayers, to manifeſt their dutiful and affectionate regard for the government by which they are protected, though it be not exactly in the manner they once propoſed. Their *purſes!* ſaid *Americus:* well, *Britannicus*, I ſhould never thought of them. Between you and me, I believe they are almoſt *empty*. And you know, *it is not an eaſy thing for an empty purſe to ſtand upright*. I aſſure you, Sir, it is *whiſpered* already, that their deſign is rather to *fill* their almoſt empty purſes than to diminiſh the *poor pittance* which remains. How! my friend, replied *Britannicus*; did you not ſuggeſt pretty early in this debate, that by the imprudent ſtep of my friend's publiſhing the firſt number of the Monitor, he was to be every way the loſer? He was to loſe, I think you ſaid, his beſt friends; and if ſo, no wonder you added, that it would affect his temporal circumſtances: but now, it ſeems, he is by the ſame paper to fill his empty purſe, and the hope of that actuates his pen! So when the Americans are *taxed*, it is ſaid "they "are an infant colony. A poor, injured, oppreſſed, "and almoſt ruined people:" but, if conſidered as our *enemy*, "they are rich, powerful, wiſe, nume-"rous, and in ſhort, every thing that can make "them formidable and render them invincible!" We, who before were giants, are now pigmies;

and they, who were feeble as pigmies and cranes, are, in an *inſtant*, an innumerable company of giants.—But muſt you be told, Sir, that government has no need, nay cannot make that man an hireling, who is naturally and cordially their friend. If government has any thing to fear from a *gooſe-quill*, it muſt be from one which is employed to oppoſe them; and could they be of opinion that ſome of the flaming, but flaſhy pamphlets which are publiſhed, are as formidable and important as their authors and admirers ſuppoſe, ſome of thoſe induſtrious pamphleteers might live in hope of promotion: but alas! there is no great danger at preſent, I hope, that government will offer to tempt the virtue of ſuch honorable gentlemen.

WELL, *Britannicus*, I muſt take my leave of you; and though I am a warm advocate for the right of private judgment; after all, I muſt confeſs, I am willing to encroach a little upon that right reſpecting miniſters of the goſpel. I own, I do not like to hear talk of the *bench of biſhops* in the parliament houſe. I think, miniſters of every denomination, ſhould *hear* at home and *pray* for peace, and in no other way be concerned with any thing, but what relates to their ſacred function. So ſaid a friend of yours, replied *Britannicus*, whoſe name I chuſe to conceal. Yet I obſerved, when *Dr. Smith*'s ſhameful perverſion of the ſacred text (who argues from a *theocracy*

to a *monarchy*, and blends *taxation* with *idolatry*, as if they were one and the ſame, when his ſermon) firſt appeared, in which we behold him blowing the trumpet of ſedition, at the head of an army already too much affected with the inchanting, infatuating ſound; your friend, forgetting all he had ſaid about miniſters, highly applauded it; and when it was propoſed to reprint this political harangue to circulate among the populace, his *praiſe* and his *purſe* were not wanting on this occaſion. And, I think, ſaid *Britannicus*, when you read the other day, the compliment which *Americanus* paid the *Doctor* for his ſermon, you highly commended him for it, and for what *Amricanus* himſelf, though a miniſter of the goſpel, had publiſhed on civil liberty.

AMERICUS frankly owned, that in ſome things he had been *deceived*; and in ſeveral inſtances more *inconſiſtent* than he was aware. *Britannicus* aſſured him, that though he had debated with freedom, as he did not think himſelf infallible, he deſired to be open to conviction. My ſole wiſh, ſaid he, in this affair is, that truth may triumph; and ſo triumph, that order and oeconomy may be eſtabliſhed: while peace, proſperity and praiſe, adorn the pleaſing conqueſt, to the mutual and laſting joy of GREAT BRITAIN and AMERICA. Their hearty *Amen* cloſed the preſent conteſt.

DIALOGUE II.

A FEW evenings after the preceding dialogue, *Britannicus* called on his friend. He found him alone, and ſo deeply engaged in thought, that he did not perceive *Britannicus*, till he thus interrupted his meditations.—Why, Sir, you ſeem to be abſent to every thing but the ſubject, whatever it be, which apparently commands your whole attention. *Americus*, thus rouzed from his reverie, ſaid, I beg your pardon, *Britannicus*, for being ſo abſent when you are preſent. It is, you will own, rather ſingular to find me in ſuch a ſituation. You have caught me in an unguarded moment: for when you entered the room, I had no inclination to attend to any thing but the affecting ſubject which then employed my buſy thoughts. Affecting ſubject indeed! I am afraid, *Britannicus*, we are undone! Yes, it is too late now—the die is caſt, and ruin is inevitable!

BRITANNICUS looked very earneſtly on his friend, and ſeemed entirely at a loſs to account for his conduct. You ſurprize and alarm me, ſaid

ſaid he; what can you mean, *Americus*, by ſuch detached, imperfect ſentences? Who, I pray you, is undone? Are you, replied *Americus*, are you, Sir, a ſtranger in BRITAIN, and know not to what I allude? I beſeech you, good Sir, anſwered *Britannicus*, that you will put off the myſtic, and put on yourſelf. Tell me plainly, *Americus*, what you have in view. What I have alluded to, *Americus* replied, is the ruinous ſtate of the nation. Taking up Dr. *Price*'s * pamphlet from off the table, this pamphlet, ſays *Americus*, has thrown ſuch light on the truly alarming ſubject, as fills me, and no doubt many more, with deep concern. I have had my fears, *Britannicus*, for ſome time; but I confeſs I was never ſo alarmed as I am now. We are, Sir, I find, at the eve of an univerſal bankruptcy; and I fear, of all that is calamitous and dreadful. In our late conteſt, towards the cloſe, I found myſelf irreſolute and yielding. I began to ſuſpect I had been deceived; but this pamphlet has removed my doubts; and I muſt add, it has alſo increaſed my fears; for the more I am perſuaded the judicious author is right, the more I am convinced that our ruin, as a nation, is at hand.

THE pamphlet, *Americus*, which has ſo much affected you, is written, I ſee, by Dr. *Price*.

* The pamphlet referred to is, Dr. *Price* on *The Nature of Civil Liberty*, &c. 3d edition.

Yes, ſaid *Americus*, it is the *Doctor*'s pamphlet on civil liberty. And if you have read it, *Britannicus*, I think you muſt own it is the moſt ſenſible thing which has been yet publiſhed on the preſent controverſy between Us and Our colonies. On your ſide the queſtion, ſaid *Britannicus*, I think it is. But in my opinion, (and I have read it, you muſt know) there are juſt and conſiderable exceptions to be made againſt ſeveral things which are advanced by Dr. *Price*. For my part, I can no more admire his reaſoning in ſome paſſages in this celebrated pamphlet, than in others I can admire his prudence.

As the *Doctor* has no objection himſelf to traverſe the ſpecious and fertile lawns of ſuppoſition, you will not, I hope, *Americus*, be offended with the following. Let us ſuppoſe then, that *G. B.* has been conſidered, in the eye of the public, for many years, a *lady* of fortune and character; and though now conſiderably advanced in life, her credit and character are more than equal to any of her ſex. Let us farther ſuppoſe, that *R. P. D. D. F. R. S.* profeſſes himſelf to be, a "conſtant and zealous well-wiſher" to this venerable *lady* *; nay, if he may be credited, there are none who have her welfare at heart more than himſelf. We will farther ſuppoſe, that under the color of ſuch friendſhip, the gentleman alluded to above, is buſily employed in inſpecting

* Page 2.

her

her *ladyſhip*'s accounts; and at laſt, *conjectures* that her affairs are in a dangerous ſituation. Full of this idea, he is, we will farther ſuppoſe, impatient to blab out the ſecret, and reſts not till he confidently aſſures the Public, ſhe cannot long maintain her credit; and more than inſinuates, that if her creditors ſuffer themſelves to be deceived much longer, the deception will be fatal, and all their property in her poſſeſſion irrecoverably loſt. Tell me, Sir, how do you think the injured *lady*, or the impartial public (I mean ſo many of them as really are ſo) would view his conduct, who was capable of acting ſuch a part under the maſk of friendſhip! If you ſuppoſe that he who acts in this manner is worthy of reproof from an injured individual, is he leſs deſerving of cenſure, who thus treats GREAT-BRITAIN HERSELF? Happy for her better friends, that ſhe is as much ſuperior to ſuch reflections, as ſhe is in property to Dr. *Price*'s miſtaken calculations. In a word, what the *Doctor* has advanced on this head, is either true or falſe. If it be falſe, why are any thus alarmed? If it be true, would it not be more honorable, in caſe of an univerſal failure, to accept of our dividend, however ſmall, than firſt to make ſure of our own trifling ſums, and then by a "wanton abuſe of power," to make a report of *that*, which, if credited, it is not eaſy to ſay at this time, whether the report would be more affecting to individuals, than it would be hurtful to the nation?

AMERICUS

AMERICUS replied, however the *Doctor* in this inſtance may have diſcovered want of prudence, and when I conſider the manner in which ſome weak people may miſimprove his faithfulneſs; perhaps, ſaid he, it was not prudent in the *Doctor* to be ſo explicit on ſo delicate a ſubject. But granting this, what have you, *Britannicus*, to object againſt the *Doctor*'s manner of reaſoning on the nature of civil liberty, and the principles of government? To me, it appears clear, nervous, conſiſtent, and, in a word, invincible. Do you recollect, *Americus*, that Dr. *Price* is a Diſſenting Miniſter; and that in your opinion, neither they, nor the clergy, ought to write on political ſubjects? You were willing, you ſaid in our laſt conference, on their account, to give up, in ſome meaſure, the ſacred right of private judgment; now, you admire the *Doctor* for his exerting it; and have no objection, I ſuppoſe, to his receiving the freedom of the faithful city in a gold box, as a ſmall token of her great eſteem for his diſtinguiſhed and ſuperior merit. I own, Sir, ſaid *Americus*, as I have not the pleaſure of knowing the *Doctor*, ſo, when I warmly commended his pamphlet, I did not give myſelf time to think of his profeſſion. I now recollect what I ſaid on that head at your houſe; and, in general, I am ſtill of the ſame opinion: but you know, *Britannicus*, there are but few general rules without ſome exception. Better ſo than worſe, *Americus*. But I wave the advantage you have given me, and

proceed

proceed to mention ſomething which is more material.

I BEGIN, with making a few remarks on what the *Doctor* has ſaid on the nature of human liberty. It is evident, that according to the *Doctor*'s ſyſtem, a principle of *ſpontaneity*, or *ſelf-determination*, is eſſential to phyſical or natural liberty; for it is this principle, ſays he, which conſtitutes us agents *. Be it ſo; the queſtion I would now aſk is, whether this ſelf-determining principle conſtitutes us *wiſe* or *fooliſh* agents? I cannot ſuppoſe you will ſay, it conſtitutes us *fooliſh* agents; and if you ſhould ſay it conſtitutes us *wiſe* agents, what an horrid idea does this convey of what you call wiſdom? for, as this principle of *ſpontaneity* or *ſelf-determination*, is ſuppoſed to govern all our actions, *natural*, *civil*, *moral*, and *religious*, or at leaſt, that it OUGHT; and as the actions of human agents in every view ſo widely differ; according to this ſyſtem, *will* and *wiſdom* (and if ſo, *vice* and *virtue*) are but different names to repreſent the ſame thing.—You forget, Sir, I preſume, ſaid *Americus*, the guarded manner in which Dr. *Price* expreſſes himſelf, when he is ſpeaking of moral liberty. He ſays, "He whoſe perceptions of moral obligation are controuled by his paſſions, has loſt his moral liberty †." No, *Americus*, I do not forget what the *Doctor* has ſaid on

* Page 3. † Page 5.

that

that ſubject. But, in my opinion, continued *Britannicus*, the vague manner in which he has expreſſed himſelf, does him but little honour: for what thoſe paſſions are which deprive us of moral liberty, and when we are controuled by them, is left undetermined; and I ſuppoſe, in both caſes, every man, whether he be wiſe or fooliſh, virtuous or vicious, is to determine for himſelf; ſo that we are juſt where we were. There is, according to this ſcheme, no ſtandard of *right* and *wrong*, *vice* and *virtue*, but the will of the agent: or if there be, it is uſeleſs; for, "as far (ſays the "*Doctor*) as, in any inſtance, the operation of "any cauſe comes in to reſtrain the power of "ſelf-government, ſo far ſlavery is introduced *."

THE *Doctor* ſuppoſes, without ſuch a principle as he ſpeaks of, the action of any agent is not properly his own. Were we to grant this, what then? Is it not as much our duty to conſider *what* our actions are, as *whoſe* they are? Or are we to conclude they are right, merely becauſe they are our OWN?—But what if there be no ſuch ſelf-determining principle in the will, which the *Doctor*, if I do not miſtake him †, ſuppoſes to be eſſential to

* Page 5.

† If any be of opinion that I have miſunderſtood the *Doctor*, and will aſſert, there is a conſiderable difference between what he calls a *principle of ſpontaneity*, or *ſelf-determination*, and what the *Arminians* call the *ſelf-determining power of the will*, I beg his candid attention to a more

to its true liberty; and from which ſelf-determining power, liberty, in all her pleaſing forms, is thought to originate and proceed—What if at

a more particular enquiry into the origin and nature of this *curious* principle, than was proper to introduce in a familiar dialogue; the natural turn of which is ſufficiently violated by *Britannicus* reading his metaphyſical and mortifying extract, inſerted in the following page.

SUPPOSING we are poſſeſſed of this curious principle, the manner in which we came by it is worthy our attention. It was either given or acquired. If *acquired*, when? and by whom? Not by a free agent, for this principle is ſuppoſed to be eſſential to free agency. I apprehend, therefore, the abſurdity is too glaring to ſay, It was acquired by any perſon.—If it be not acquired, it muſt be *given*. But, by whom? If you anſwer, By Him who is the Author of every good and perfect gift; I would further obſerve—This principle is either *now* what it was when it was firſt given to *Adam*, or it is not. If it be, whence is it ſo extravagantly various in its operations, not only in different agents, but at different times in the ſame agent? If it be not now, what it was when firſt given to *Adam*, the change is either for the better or the worſe. If for the *better*, then we are (contrary to revelation and the common ſenſe of mankind) gainers by our fall. If it be for the *worſe*, who but the haughty or unwiſe would incautiouſly follow a principle, which, if they be not reſtrained, may lead them to perdition? And who but a perplexing *theoriſt* would puzzle the people about a principle, which, if it have any exiſtence, appears to be a corrupt principle, and as much the ſpring of vice as of virtue? One plain *precept* from the ſacred page, is worth ten thouſand corrupt and flattering principles; and where perſons are free from an unhappy prejudice, one plain *caution* from the inſpired volume, is a ſufficient guard againſt them. (1 *Peter* ii. 13. 2 *Peter* ii. 10.)

laſt

laſt this ſuppoſed origin of liberty, ſhould appear to be as *ſpurious* as it is *ſpecious?* Mortifying as the idea may be to you, *Americus*, what is now ſuppoſed, is fully proved, by one who was as well acquainted with the true nature of human liberty, in every view, as Dr. *Price:* and, that my friend may appear to be worthy your regard, I add, that on this ſubject, if he be not a diſciple, he is at leaſt a follower of Mr. *Locke* *. The perſon whom I now ſpeak of, ſaid *Britannicus*, is the late JONATHAN EDWARDS, who was Preſident of the College at *New-Jerſey*. As I recollect I have with me an extract that I lately made from that maſterly writer on this ſubject, with your leave I will read it. *Americus* conſented; and his friend produced his extract, in which were theſe words:—" If the will deter-
" mines itſelf, then either the will is *active* in
" determining its volitions, or it is not. If it
" be active in it, then the determination is an
" *act* of the will; and ſo there is one act of
" the will determining another. But if the will
" is not active in the determination, then how
" does it *exerciſe* any liberty in it? Theſe gen-
" tlemen (he is ſpeaking of thoſe whom he calls
" *Arminians* †) ſuppoſe that the thing wherein
" the

* See his Eſſay on Human Underſtanding, Book II. Ch. 21. §. 14, 25.

† Some through ignorance, and ſome on a worſe foundation, have exclaimed to the author of theſe dialogues—" Why you

" the will *exerciſes* liberty, is in its determining
" its own acts. But how can this be, if it be not
" *active* in determining? Certainly the will, or
" the ſoul, cannot *exerciſe any liberty* in that
" wherein it don't *act*, or wherein it don't *exer-*
" *ciſe itſelf*. So that if either part of this di-
" lemma be taken, this ſcheme of liberty, con-
" ſiſting in ſelf-determining power, is over-
" thrown. If there be an act of the will in de-
" termining all its own free acts, then one free
" act of the will is determined by another; and
" ſo we have the abſurdity of every free act,
" even the very firſt, determined by a foregoing
" free act. But if there be no act or exerciſe
" of the will in determining its own acts, then
" no liberty is exerciſed in determining them.

you believe as Mr. *Weſley* does! You are going over to his ſentiments as an *Arminian*." To ſuch cavillers the author returns the following anſwer. They who make this objection believe ſome truths that Mr. *Weſley* does, or it is their *ſhame* if they do not. For that gentleman believes there is a God; that his law is holy; that the violation of it is ſin; and that there is no redemption for ſinners but by *Jeſus Chriſt*. On the other hand, they who have made theſe objections, no more approve the religious ſentiments of Dr. *Price*, though they admire him on civil liberty, than they do the diſtinguiſhing ſentiments of Mr. *Weſley*: nor would it be to their honour if they did. And why may it not be ſuppoſed that Mr. *Weſley* is coming over at laſt to the *Calviniſts*, as that the author of theſe dialogues is warping to the *Arminians*; ſince the *Arminians* in all their garden, have not a flower they more eſteem, than the ſelf-determining power of the will?

" From

" From whence it follows, that no liberty conſiſts " in the will's power to determine its own acts: " or, which is the ſame thing, that there is no " ſuch thing as liberty conſiſting in a ſelf-deter- " mining power of the will."

I AM not, ſaid *Americus*, ſufficiently verſed in metaphyſical ſubtleties, to form at preſent a proper judgment of your extract; but whether the will has power to determine its own acts, or whether its liberty originates and primarily conſiſts in ſuch a ſelf-determining power or no, it is certain that, *civil liberty* conſiſts in *ſelf-government*. " Then only is a ſtate free when it is governed " by its own will *." But what do you mean by its *own* will, *Americus?* Do you mean to oppoſe that term only to " foreign diſcretion, and " to the impoſitions of any extraneous will or " power †?" If ſo, GREAT BRITAIN is a free ſtate: for, to what foreign diſcretion, to what extraneous will or power is ſhe ſubject? Or by the ſtate's *own* will, do you mean the will of the majority of the ſtate? In this view alſo GREAT BRITAIN is yet a free ſtate. But if by its *own* will, you mean the will of every individual, then, I affirm, there is no free ſtate on earth; nor ever was; the Grecian ſtates, in all their fancied glory, not excepted.

* Page 19. † Page 3.

Is it not very extraordinary, *Americus*, that *Dr. Price*, who in effect is perpetually exclaiming, THE PEOPLE! THE PEOPLE*! to whom he aſcribes omnipotence †, and in whoſe favour he ſays almoſt all that flattery and folly can dictate; is it not very extraordinary, *Americus*, that when the *Doctor* pleaſes, the *ſame people* ſhould be repreſented as defective in wiſdom, and that a majority of the people are not always to be truſted? This is extraordinary indeed. But how, *Britannicus*, will you make it appear, that *Dr. Price* is ſo inconſiſtent? From his own words, ſaid *Britannicus*; for, notwithſtanding all the compliments which the *Doctor* pays the people, declaring that civil government is their creature; that it originates with them, is conducted under their direction, and has in view nothing but their happineſs ‡; notwithſtanding all this, the *Doctor* is of opinion, that it is impoſſible to judge properly of the important queſtion which is ſuppoſed to be now ſubſiſting between Us and Our colonies, "without correct ideas of liberty *in general*; and "of the nature, limits, and principles of civil "liberty *in particular* §." What is this intereſting queſtion, "which deſerves the moſt careful

* The popular leaders in all ages have called themſelves *The people*. Blackſtone's Com. vol. iv. page 438.

† Their's, ſays the Doctor, is the *only real* omnipotence.

‡ Page 6. § Page 1.

" attention of every *Engliſhman* who values his " liberty, and wiſhes to avoid ſtaining himſelf " with the guilt of invading it?" 'Tis this. " Our colonies in NORTH AMERICA appear to " be now determined to do and ſuffer every thing, " under the perſuaſion, that GREAT BRITAIN is " attempting to rob them of that liberty to " which every member of ſociety, and all civil " communities, have a natural and unalienable " right:" and the queſtion now is, whether this be a reaſonable perſuaſion; that is, whether GREAT BRITAIN be attempting to rob the AMERICANS of that liberty to which every member of ſociety, and all civil communities, have a natural and unalienable right, or no. Intereſting, highly intereſting as this queſtion is, the *Doctor* ſays it is *impoſſible* to judge properly of it, without correct ideas of liberty *in general*; and of the nature, limits, and principles of civil liberty *in particular*. Is not this ſaying, there are but *very few* who are able to judge properly of the matter in diſpute between Us and Our colonies? And if the people are ſuch poor judges in matters of ſuch high importance, it is enough to make one tremble to hear, that theirs is the only real omnipotence, that civil government is under their direction, and, that they have power to model it as they pleaſe *.

* Page 12.

COULD

COULD we conceive, *Americus*, of an agent who was omnipotent and omnivolent, if his wiſdom, and regard for truth and juſtice, were not equal to his will and power, ſuch an agent could neither be happy in himſelf, nor truly reſpected by any who was acquainted with his true character. The *Cyclops* may admire *Polyphemus*, but *Ulyſſes* looks on ſuch a monſter with an unavoidable mixture of ſlaviſh awe and deſerved contempt. Yet ſuch a monſter does *Dr. Price* ſometimes repreſent the people. From his colouring, they appear like the giant I have mentioned, all *will* and *power*, without wiſdom to conduct themſelves for the public good, or to prevent their own deſtruction! What wonder, therefore, that the majority of ſuch a political body is not always to be truſted. The *Doctor* himſelf thinks it is not. "Let it be granted "that the majority of the kingdom favour the "preſent meaſures. No good argument (in the "*Doctor*'s opinion) could be drawn from hence "againſt receding*." So that the *Doctor*'s reaſoning on civil government, *Americus*, may be thus ſummed up. "To be free, in general, "is for a ſtate to be guided by its own will. As "far as, in any inſtance, the operation of any "cauſe comes in to reſtrain the power of ſelf-"government, ſo far ſlavery is introduced: nor "do I think that a preciſer idea than this of li-

* Page 88.

" berty and ſlavery can be formed. However, " do not miſtake me, for (whatever I may have " ſaid to the contrary) I do not ſuppoſe that " any real and laſting advantage would reſult " from my ſcheme of civil government were it " adopted. It is true, I conſider the people as " omnipotent and omnivolent; but, I am ſuf- " ficiently aware, they are not always over wiſe " or over honeſt; therefore, no argument can be " drawn in favour of a majority, except it be " ſuch a majority as I approve: for ſhould a " minority think as I do (no matter from what " motive) the majority who differ from us, " ought to recede from their meaſures, or elſe, " if you will believe me, they are either knaves " or fools."

On the whole, whether I conſider *Dr. Price*, *Americus*, as a philoſopher or as a divine, I think, nor am I alone in the thought, that he has acquitted himſelf but poorly in writing on the nature of human liberty. " Nothing (ſays the " *Doctor*) can be of ſo much conſequence to us " as liberty. It is the foundation of all honour, " and the chief privilege and glory of our na- " tures *. But, what does the *Doctor* mean by liberty? Why, that every *fop* and every *fool*, as well as every wiſe and prudent man, ſhould be guided by his own will, or be under the direc-

* Page 6.

tion

tion of ſelf-government; for whatever affects that, in the *Doctor*'s opinion, introduces ſlavery. Is not this ſaying that liberty is every thing one moment, and that it is nothing, or rather worſe than nothing the next? If, "the plain "and obvious meaning of the words *freedom* and "*liberty*, in common ſpeech, is *power, opportu-* "*tunity*, or *advantage, that any one has, to do as* "*he pleaſes* *," then, the real value of liberty is always exactly proportioned to the wiſdom and rectitude of the agent who is poſſeſſed of it. If the wiſdom and rectitude of an agent be equal to the power, opportunity, and advantage he has to do what he pleaſes, liberty is a precious jewel indeed. So conſidered, her price is above rubies. But if the wiſdom and rectitude of any agent, or any number of agents, be not equal to the power, opportunity, and advantage of doing what they pleaſe, their liberty is of leſs value. And if there be any agent who is deſtitute of wiſdom and rectitude, and who is only poſſeſſed of what is contrary to them, his liberty is of no value at all. To reſtrain him from doing miſchief, is a favour to the public and no injury to himſelf.

As you have now mentioned *Dr. Price*, ſaid *Americus*, in his proper character, I mean as a divine, you will, I am ſure, agree with me that he acts conſiſtently with that character when he ſo

* Edwards on the Will, page 38.

warmly recommends faſting and prayer; and when he ſo ſincerely laments our inſenſibility as a nation in this hour of tremendous danger. Indeed, Sir, replied *Britannicus*, in the paſſage you allude to, I can neither think the *Doctor* is conſiſtent or juſt. Not *conſiſtent:* for on the *Doctor*'s principles, to whom are we to pray? To God? What has he to do with civil government? According to the *Doctor*'s ſyſtem, it is, *without God in the world!* It is the *creature* of the people. It *originates* with them. It is conducted under *their direction*; and has in view *nothing* but their happineſs. God it ſeems, is neither its AUTHOR, CONDUCTOR, or END. On ſuch principles, therefore, how can we pretend to faſt and pray unto Him? Yet this is what many *pretend* to in BRITAIN and AMERICA *. And what do they pray for? To be governed according to their own will? That is ſo fickle and various, that to grant it, is to deſtroy the idea of government, and is what has occaſioned the preſent confuſion. Or do they pray, that we may all be united in judgment? that cannot be without ſubmiſſion; and which of the two parties muſt ſubmit to the other? Be which it may, and however beneficial to both, the operation of any cauſe that comes in to reſtrain the power of ſelf-government, ac-

* When ye faſted and mourned, ſaid the Lord to the Jews, did ye at all faſt unto ME, *even* to ME? Zech. vii. 5. What anſwer could the Doctor make on his own principles to ſuch an alarming queſtion?

cording

cording to the *Doctor*'s ſyſtem, introduces ſlavery; ſo that as far as I can ſee, the object they addreſs in prayer muſt either do nothing at all, or be in danger of being conſidered by ſome as an enemy to civil liberty. And I aſſure you, Sir, the Divine Being is far from eſcaping the cenſure of ſome of our modern patriots. His words have been perverted by them, but they cannot be eraſed: His authority has been deſpiſed, but it cannot be deſtroyed.

But the *Doctor* is not more *juſt* on this ſubject than he is conſiſtent. He ſays, in the paſſage before us. "In this hour of tremendous danger, "it would become us to turn our thoughts to "Heaven. This is what our brethren in the "colonies are doing. From one end of *North* "*America* to the other, they are Fasting and "Praying. But what are we doing? Shocking "thought! we are ridiculing them as *fanatics*, "and ſcoffing at religion.—We are running wild "after pleaſure, and forgetting every thing ſe- "rious and decent at *maſquerades*.—We are "gambling in gaming houſes; trafficking for "boroughs; perjuring ourſelves at elections *, "and ſelling ourſelves for places †." So much for the *Doctor*'s juſtice and impartiality as an hiſtorian.

Now, let us ſuppoſe, that in a few weeks, ſome of the *Doctor*'s pamphlets will reach the

* See Dialogue I, page 20. † Page 98.

Congreſs, and that they are circulated amongſt the provincials. What an unhappy effect muſt ſuch paſſages produce wherever they gain credit. " See, ſays an artful incendiary, amongſt them, " ſee, what maſters you are like to ſerve if you " tamely ſubmit to the BRITISH YOKE. No man " is better acquainted with the genius, temper, " and practice of the *Engliſh*, than *Dr. Price.* " He lives in the *metropolis*, the center of ob- " ſervation. He is himſelf a miniſter of the " goſpel, and has no doubt an inviolable regard " to truth; and yet, you ſee, how the *Doctor* " repreſents them. Inſtead of prayer, what can " you obſerve but profanity? And inſtead of " caution and unanimity, what is there but folly, " faction, and fatal ſecurity? Which ſide then, " think you, is Providence likely to favour?"— Is this argument, *Americus*, or is it declamation? Is it *juſt*, to tranſmit ſo partial an account of our moral conduct on yon ſide of the water, which is ſufficiently defective without any aggravation? Guilty as we are, there are many, yea multitudes in GREAT BRITAIN, who continue in prayer for Us and Our colonies. Yes, my friend, even in BRITAIN there are thouſands who ſincerely lament all that is irreligious amongſt us, as much as *Dr. Price.* And give me leave to add, though I have a good opinion of many in AMERICA as men of ſenſe, of honour and religion, yet, if there be any people under Heaven who by their prayers intend to preſerve their purſes, I mean,

who intend thereby to exempt themſelves from paying a proportionable ſhare of the public expence, I am ſure, ſuch devotion is not acceptable to Him who hath ſaid, RENDER TO ALL THEIR DUE,

TRUE, *Britannicus*, we are to render to all their due, but how will you prove that any thing is due to us from our colonies? What right have we to expect any thing from them more than they pleaſe to give us? If you have any right over the colonies, on what is it founded? On your ſuperior wiſdom, or riches? On conqueſts, charters, compacts, or obligation conferred? The *Doctor* has ſhewn that your pretended right over the colonies cannot be ſupported on any of theſe grounds, or on any other, but adequate repreſentation. He has *attempted* to do this, *Americus*, but in ſo doing, he has actually verified the old adage, which ſays, "Wiſe men are not always wiſe."—Over doing, in more caſes than one, is undoing. And he who proves too much, frequently proves nothing at all.—If we have no claim from the colonies on any of the grounds the *Doctor* mentions, nor ever can have but by adequate repreſentation, may not the original natives of America, uſe the ſame arguments with equal force againſt all thoſe emigrants, however patriotic, who have driven them from their antient ſettlements, and diſturbed their repoſe to gratify their own ambition? Might not an Indian chief, if properly acquainted with

Dr.

Dr. *Price*'s pamphlet on civil liberty, addreſs the members of the *congreſs* in ſome ſuch terms as theſe?

" GENTLEMEN, At this remarkable *criſis*, give " me leave, in behalf of my *brethren*, to addreſs " you in the ſpirit of freedom. You profeſs " yourſelves to be the offspring of liberty, and " avowed enemies to every ſpecies of tyranny " and oppreſſion. Hear the complaints then, " and redreſs the real grievances of an injured " people. What have we done, that our liberty " and property ſhould be violated any more than " yours? Did we croſs the ocean to invade you? " No: we meditated no ſuch ambitious deſign. " Have we attempted to take from you the fruits " of your labour, and to overturn that form of " government in BRITAIN, which you held ſo " ſacred? This cannot be pretended. On the " contrary, this is what you have done to us. " You have tranſported yourſelves to our peace- " ful plains, and employed your fleets and ar- " mies to deprive us of all we held valuable and " ſacred. And now, inſtead of pity, behold de- " riſion! Inſtead of remorſe, an artful attempt " to juſtify the injury. You call us, *Wild-In-* " *dians*, and (aſtoniſhing inſtance of *weakneſs* and " *wickedneſs*) YOUR OWN SLAVES *! *What!* can " the ſons of freedom talk of their OWN SLAVES? " But if we be yours; if you have a right to our

* Page 94.

" coun-

" country, our liberty and property; on what " is that right founded? Is it founded on " *conqueſt?* Conqueſt, ſays the man whom you " hold in ſuch high eſteem, gives you no " ſuch dominion over the conquered. Autho- " rity derived from conqueſt, being founded " on violence, he aſſerts, is never rightful *. " On what then is your authority founded? On " *charters?* Chartered privileges you now de- " ſpiſe; being taught to look for better claims, " and to derive your rights from a higher ſource †. " Will you ſay, it is founded on *compact?* No: " you know we never were in a proper ſituation " to enter into any fair compact with you: and " if we had, this great *Doctor*, as you call him, " informs us, that compacts are not binding " when they have reſpect to the unalienable " rights of human nature ‡. And though you " call us *Wild Indians*, let me tell you, we are " partakers of *human nature*, and love to have " *our will as well as you*.

" On what then, do you found your oppreſ- " ſive claim over us? Is it on *obligations con-* " *ferred?* But what are the favours which we, as " a collective body, have received from you §? " The injuries we have received from you are

* Page 24. † Page 32, 40. ‡ Page 25.

§ The author means to except the religious advantages which any of the *Indians* may have received from the *Americans*; but he is afraid their ſlaves have enjoyed but few.

" nu-

" numerous, recent, and laſting. And had we
" received as great favours, as we have ſuſtained
" injuries, liberty, ſays the great man, whom
" you all admire, is too dear a price for them
" all *.—Why ſhould I mention your *wealth?*
" This, you know, never confers real dignity †.
" Eſpecially when a great part of it is the fruit
" of invaſion and plunder. As to the *numbers*
" of which you boaſt, had you not depopu-
" lated our deſerts, and many of you emigrated
" from other countries, we ſhould have been
" far more numerous than you. What then re-
" mains to ſupport your oppreſſive ſuperiority
" over us? I know of nothing, except it be
" your *knowledge* and *virtue*. Of the *former*, I
" am not a proper judge; but I can aſſure you,
" we *poor Indians*, wiſh to have more ſtrong and
" more conſiſtent proofs of the *latter*.—Forgive
" this freedom. 'Tis your example that fires
" my courage. You cannot blame my conduct
" or principles, without condemning your *own*.
" When the nation of which you are a part, de-
" mand what they believe is their due, inſtead of
" ſubmiſſion, the alarming, the reiterated cry is,
" TO ARMS! TO ARMS! If the *ſhadow* of op-
" preſſion be ſo grievous to you, what do you
" think the *ſubſtance* muſt be to us! May I not
" hope then, that you will recede from all that
" is iniquitous? that you will act to us on your

* Page 26. † Page 36.

" own

" own principles? or that you will honeſtly con-
" feſs, that you have no greater value for liberty
" and equity, than thoſe you affect to call *Wild*
" *Indians*, and whom, to this day, you are not
" aſhamed to call YOUR OWN SLAVES?"

I HAVE heard you, *Britannicus*, with all the pa-tience I am maſter of; but, I confeſs you have tired it ſeverely. How can you repreſent the Coloniſts as invading, conquering, and plundering the original natives of *America?* when you muſt know, all this was done before they went to reſide there. Was it not the very people whom you eſpouſe, the ſame court, I mean, that now diſtreſſes the Coloniſts, who ſent their fleets and armies to invade, conquer, and plunder the original natives? They who now people AMERICA from this iſland, had no hand either in the conqueſt, or the carnage attending it. So then, ſaid *Britannicus*, I find your good friends on the other ſide the water, did nothing at laſt but *run and take the ſpoil.* But why did they do that, if they had any ſcruples to the rights of conqueſt? Or if it be but of late date that they plainly ſee that authority founded on violence is never rightful, why do they not now abandon the eſtates they have ſeized, and reſtore to the original natives their liberty and property? Remember, " RECTITUDE IS DIGNITY, OPPRESSION ONLY IS MEANNESS; AND JUSTICE, HONOR *."

* Page 88.

SURELY

SURELY Sir, ſaid *Americus*, you forget what the *Doctor* has delivered on this ſubject in page 39 and 40. Give me leave to read the paſſage I have now in view.—" If, ſays the *Doctor*, the " land on which the colonies firſt ſettled had any " proprietors, they were the natives. The greateſt " part of it they bought of the natives. They have " ſince cleared and cultivated it; and, without " any help from us, converted a wilderneſs into " fruitful and pleaſant fields. It is therefore " now, on a double account, their property; " and no power on earth can have any right to " diſturb them in the poſſeſſion of it; or take " from them, without their conſent, any part of " its produce." What ſay you to this, *Britannicus?* Why, I ſay, replied *Britannicus*, if the argument was as juſt as it is ſpecious, it would be more worth my notice than at preſent I think it is. Obſerve, *Americus*, all this ſhew of honeſty and honor hangs upon an IF. IF, ſays the *Doctor*, the land on which the Coloniſts firſt ſettled had *any* proprietors, (but that it ſeems is doubtful) they were the natives. And who were the natives? *Wild Indians*, whom they conſider as their *own ſlaves*. Now, " if nothing can be more chimerical than property founded on conqueſt," and if liberty be of ſuch ineſtimable value that it cannot be purchaſed with money, how in the name of common-ſenſe, came theſe *Wild Indians* to be their *own ſlaves?* But viewing them as ſuch, it is very kind in the Coloniſts, no doubt, to

to purchaſe land of their *own ſlaves*. Whether they were paid in *caſh*, by *great promiſes*, or by *hard ſtripes*, is not ſaid. But we will ſuppoſe for once, that they bought ſome of the land at a fair price, and honeſtly paid for the purchaſes which they made. I aſk, *Americus*, whether the Coloniſts *could* ever have had a farm, a plantation, or a country-ſeat in that *fine* country, if we had not conquered it? And when it was conquered, give me leave farther to aſk, whether any of them *would* have choſen to have made any purchaſe on the continent, and to have dwelt on what is now ſaid to be, on a double account, his own property, had he not expected to have his property guarded, and his perſon protected by the legiſlative power of GREAT-BRITAIN? who have ſpent millions on this foundation *.

BUT will any one ſay, *Britannicus*, that all we have done for them, has not been more on our own account than on theirs? I anſwer, that

* The author of the pamphlet, called, The Rights of GREAT-BRITAIN aſſerted, againſt the Claims of AMERICA, ſays, That the total of the money laid out by GREAT-BRITAIN on the revolted provinces, ſince the acceſſion of the Houſe of *Hanover*, which was in 1714, amounts to 34,697,142*l.* 10*s.* 10*d.* If ſo, as that author's calculations only include a term of 61 years, we have laid out for *America*, for theſe laſt ſixty-one years, (excluſive of the money ſpent on their account in the two laſt wars) upwards of FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHT THOUSAND, EIGHT HUNDRED AND FIVE POUNDS A YEAR.

queſtion,

queſtion, *Americus*, by aſking another. Will any one ſay, if this were our motive, that we have not been *grievouſly* diſappointed? I aſk too, Is it reaſonable that ſo many millions ſhould be expended without any view of national advantage? Yet what do we receive in return? You reply, their trade. But all things conſidered, *Americus*, can they do better for themſelves than trade with thoſe who have protected them from their enemies at a vaſt expence; who have advanced more than a million to pay their own native forces, employed in their own cauſe *; who have given them longer credit than they can expect at every market; and who, in a word, have raiſed them from a ſtate of weakneſs, poverty, and obſcurity, to their preſent—no, I mean to their late flouriſhing ſtate? Who but the revolted colonies, would not be glad to trade with us, on ſuch advantageous terms to themſelves? Why is their trade then mentioned as a fair ballance to the millions expended by this nation on their account?

THE *Doctor*, *Americus*, conſiders the lands which the Coloniſts poſſeſs, on a double account their own property. But, as he does not apprehend they have obtained any juſt right by *conqueſt* or by *charter*, how are the lands which they inherit on a *double* account their property? Why *firſt*, their

* See *The Rights of* Great-Britain *aſſerted.*

anceſtors

anceſtors bought them of the natives; and what then? Why, having bought the land, they have ſince "cleared and cultivated it;—and con-"verted a wilderneſs into fruitful and pleaſant "fields:" therefore, he ſuppoſes, their induſtry gives them an *additional* right to the lands which they poſſeſs. This argument is not only curious, but criminal. It is *curious*; for having purchaſed and paid for an eſtate, what wonder if I ſhould clear and cultivate it? But if by doing this, I ſhould convert a wilderneſs into a fruitful field, who but Dr. *Price*, would think of inferring from hence, that I had now a double right to my *own* eſtate? Cultivation is the end of purchaſe; and by it, the induſtrious have *double advantage*; but thereby they acquire no *new* right to their *own* eſtate. But the argument, if I may call it one, appears to me in a *criminal*, as well as in a curious light. The idea conveyed is, that *labour* gives the induſtrious a *real* right to the private property of another, if it does not give them *equal* right with purchaſe and payment. If ſo, the induſtrious *tenant* has acquired ſome property *in* his *lord*'s eſtate, and may, in a few years, diſpute the title with his *lordſhip*. But where honeſty and induſtry are united, ſuch *yeomen*, who are the ſtrength and honour of every nation where they reſide; ſuch valuable members of ſociety will be contented to reap the fruits of their own induſtry, without once imagining that the heath or deſart which they have cultivated is theirs, becauſe they

have turned it into a fruitful field: or if by purchaſe and payment the lands which they cultivate be really their *own*, they will not think them leſs ſo, if invaſion and plunder ſhould again make their fruitful fields an heath, or a deſert.

WHERE there is a common right to any parcel of land, in ſome inſtances, (as digging ſand or gravel) labour gives the induſtrious a kind of property which he had not before. I ſay, a *kind* of property, for ſuppoſing any piece of waſte ground to be the common right of any pariſh, (for the ſake of argument we leave the lord of the manor out of the queſtion) in ſuch a caſe, no kind of labour could make it lawful for any one who had a common right to the waſte to gain a *particular* right to himſelf any way injurious to his fellow commoners. *"The graſs my horſe has bit" on a common, I grant, becomes my property without the aſſignation or conſent of any body; but if I encloſe a part of the common as a paſture for my horſe, or with a view only to my own profit, and ſhould plead I had a particular right to this paſture becauſe I had by my own induſtry fenced it out from other cattle and cleared it of thiſtles, I verily think, the next time the boys perambulated the bounds of the pariſh, the inhabitants would inform them that I was more artful than induſtrious; that I ought to be con-

* Locke on Government, ſeventh edit. Book II. Sect. 29. page 197.

ſidered as acting the part of a common enemy; and that therefore it was their duty to throw down my fences and let my horſe with theirs once more graze at large on the uncultivated waſte. If the plea of labour be inadmiſſible in the above inſtance, how much more when it interferes with *private* property, and is ſuppoſed to be as valid to confer right as purchaſe * ?

When a man knows his title to any peculiar property he poſſeſſes, will not bear a ſtrict examination, he is too apt to repreſent it in ſuch a light as ſhall make examination unneceſſary, and his claim appear inconteſtibly good. It is in this manner that *Dr. Price* repreſents the right which the coloniſts have to the land they poſſeſs. It is theirs, ſays he, on a double account. Who then would call in queſtion ſuch a title? And yet you ſee, *Americus*, to what this boaſt and artifice amounts. The vanity of the boaſt, the ingenuity of the artifice, is aggravated by the effrontery that is connected with it. The *Doctor* ſays, They

* "It is an antient maxim of the law, (ſays one of the living ornaments of the bench of juſtice) that no title is completely good, unleſs the right of poſſeſſion be joined with the right of property; which right is then denominated a double right, *jus duplicatum*, or *droit droit*. And when to this double right the actual poſſeſſion is alſo united, when there is, according to the expreſſion of Fleta, *juris & ſciſinæ conjunctio*, then, and then only, is the title completely legal." Blackſtone's Com. Book II. Chap. XIII. p. 199.

have cleared and cultivated their lands, WITHOUT ANY HELP FROM US *. Shameful aſſertion! which does not more effectually deſtroy all that is affirmed of our *generoſity*, than it does all that is ſaid of their *gratitude*.

WELL, *Britannicus*, " ſuppoſe the worſt." " Suppoſe, ſaid *Americus*, that in oppoſition to " all their own declarations, the coloniſts are " now aiming at independance. If they can " ſubſiſt without you, is it to be wondered at? " Did there ever exiſt a *community*, or even an " *individual*, that would not do the ſame?— " Suppoſe it true, then, that they are indeed " contending for a better † conſtitution and

* When the reader recollects the ſums we have expended on their account and for what, (ſee page 48.) it is hoped he will not think this epithet too ſtrong.

† Notwithſtanding *Dr. Price* ſuppoſes the coloniſts are now contending for a better conſtitution of government, and more liberty than we enjoy, was any perſon in America to write with as much freedom againſt the Congreſs as *Dr. Price* has on the conſtitution and government of GREAT BRITAIN, every plea of his being an unconnected individual, of writing from conviction, of aiming at the public good, would be urged in vain. Deaf to every argument, however ſpecious, that affected their BABEL, they would in all probability at once deprive the officious *patriot* of liberty and life: whoſe ſuſpended remains (with other recent and ſhocking facts) would in ſilent and awful eloquence proclaim, THAT INDEPENDANCE IS ONE THING, AND LIBERTY ANOTHER! And yet, notwithſtanding all this, ENGLAND is, *The Houſe of Bondage*, and AMERICA, forſooth, *The Land of Canaan!*

" more

" more liberty than we enjoy: ought this to " make us angry * ?" Whether it ought or no, I own, it almoſt makes me angry, *Americus*, when hypocriſy is held up as a virtue, and the public are deceived by falſe and ſpecious pretences. For, if after all, the coloniſts are aiming at independancy, which at laſt you are compelled to own, why are any amuſed and miſled as if they were *loyal ſubjects*, and only wanted to enjoy *adequate* repreſentation. Taxation and repreſentation (unleſs peace be reſtored) ought to be mentioned no more. " The AMERICANS themſelves have " deſerted that ground. They ſpeak no longer as " ſubjects †." Nor do their principal abettors conſider them any longer in that light. *Dr. Price* is not pleaſed that we ſhould call the colonies in NORTH AMERICA, *Our colonies* ‡. Why ſo? If thoſe be not our colonies which we have planted, watered and protected, is it poſſible we can call any colony our own? If they be not our colonies, why does *Dr. Price* himſelf ſo frequently call them ſo? No wonder the people err, when they have ſuch a precedent! If they be not our colonies, what are they? " Our fellow-ſubjects," ſays the *Doctor*. But what, *Americus*, does he mean by that ambiguous phraſe? Does he mean, that they ought to be equally ſubject to the legiſlative authority of GREAT BRITAIN, as thoſe who chuſe

* Page 41—101.

† See the Rights of Great Britain aſſerted, &c. p. 11.

‡ Page 31.

to reſide there * ? We can only ſay, we wiſh they were. Or does the *Doctor* mean to aſſert they are ſo? It is ſufficient to ſay (when what is matter of fact is ſo *evident*) we are ſure they are not.

I HOPE, *Britannicus*, you have now given me your principal objections againſt the pamphlet I yet eſteem. Or am I, ſaid *Americus*, to expect any addition? As you ſeem to be wearied, replied *Britannicus*, I will not treſpaſs much longer on your patience, already ſeverely tried: otherwiſe, I ſhould take notice of ſeveral other paſſages in the *Doctor*'s pamphlet. Pardon me, however, if I yet trouble you by alluding to a few.——What think you of what the *Doctor* aſſerts in page 96? "I know, ſays he, that I am "now ſpeaking the ſenſe of ſome of the wiſeſt "men in America. It has long been their wiſh "that Britain would ſhut up all their ports." If ſo, why are *Britons* blamed for their cruelty, and the Americans pitied, as if they were thereby greatly injured? Should you reply, We intend their ruin, though it may eventually tend to their good. I would obſerve, this anſwer is as great a burleſque on *our* wiſdom, as the charge itſelf is on *yours*.

* If, all things conſidered, any ſubject of the BRITISH EMPIRE does not *chuſe* to reſide on the other ſide of the Atlantic, who compels him to go, or to remain there? And if, all things conſidered, it be his *choice*, and he gives it the *preference*, why does he *complain*, when in that inſtance he does what he PLEASES?

ONCE

ONCE more. What think you, Sir, of the *Doctor*'s conſiſtency, when he ſays, "Many of "us are perſuaded, that they (the coloniſts) will "be much happier under our government, than "under any government of their own; and that "their liberties will be ſafer when held for them "by us, than when truſted in their own hands. "How kind it is, (adds the *Doctor* ironically) "thus to take upon us the trouble of judging "for them what is moſt for their happineſs *?" And is not the *Doctor*, *Americus*, notwithſtanding all his ſarcaſtic reflections, is he not, in this reſpect at leaſt, a true *Briton?* Does he not take upon him the trouble of judging for the Canadians what is moſt for their happineſs? Does he not apprehend that their liberties will be ſafer when held for them by us, than when truſted in their own hands? Nothing can be kinder, *Americus*, except his being *angry* with us for our having a more juſt regard for civil and religious liberty than himſelf. "Alas! it often happens "in the *political world* as it does in *religion*, that "the people who cry out moſt vehemently for "liberty to themſelves are the moſt unwilling to "grant it to others." Page 92, 93. It appears to me, that the *Doctor* ſpeaks experimentally on this ſubject.

THE Canadians are Catholics, *Britannicus*. What then? Are *Catholics* and *wild Indians* to be

* Page 57.

deprived

deprived of their liberty? Are they not members of ſociety? Yes, ſaid *Americus*; but not of civil ſociety. Indeed! why then did the coloniſts court their favour? why threaten, nay attempt to deſtroy their citadel if they would not aſſiſt them in the unnatural oppoſition they were making to their beſt friends? Really, this is very *civil!* And ſhould the *Canadians* and *Indians* improve on ſuch an example, they will doubtleſs not only be civilized, but in a little while be quite *polite*. I might further obſerve, that according to the *Doctor*'s ſentiments, neither the coloniſts, nor the court of GREAT BRITAIN, have any right over the Canadians at all. Why are they then diſturbed by either of us? And if liberty conſiſt in doing what we like beſt, and it ſhould pleaſe them to reſent the conduct of the coloniſts who diſturb their quiet as well as ours, who, on the *Doctor*'s principles, can ſay they are to blame?

IT is well, ſaid *Americus*, it is well for you, *Britannicus*, that what has paſſed between us in private, is likely to go no farther. Was the *Doctor* to hear of the freedoms you have taken with his performance, I am perſuaded you would not eſcape his cenſure. Where then, ſaid *Britannicus*, is his regard for liberty? Is it poſſible he could condemn me for exerting that liberty which he admires, or affects to admire, in every man? And which, he conſiders as "the founda-" tion of all honour, and the chief privilege and "glory

" glory of our natures *." Diſmiſs your anxiety on my account, *Americus*; for ſhould the ſubſtance of our friendly chat be made public, aſſure yourſelf, I have nothing to fear from *Dr. Price*. In the firſt place, I ſuppoſe, I ſhould be conſidered as beneath his notice; and if I were not, to be tolerably conſiſtent with himſelf, he muſt either applaud my conduct, or on more accounts than one, condemn his own.

BEFORE we part, let me ſeriouſly aſk you, *Americus*, whether you think it becomes a man of *Dr. Price*'s good ſenſe, to amuſe and perplex the people, with what he ſuppoſes but few can underſtand? Whether you think it becomes him to find fault with the conſtitution, to propoſe ſomething like an important alteration, which at laſt appears to be a mere cobweb: (*curious* but *uſeleſs*, nay, to ſome *dangerous*) and then to deſtroy the web which he has wove, by hoping that, every one will conſider what he has ſaid in Part I. Sect. 3. of ſubjecting a number of ſtates to a general council repreſenting them all, as ENTIRELY THEORETICAL; and not as a propoſal of any thing he wiſhes to take place under the Britiſh Empire †: does it, I ſay, become a gentleman of the *Doctor*'s official character and diſtinguiſhed abilities, which are truly reſpectable, to employ his time in this manner?—The *Doctor* firſt faſhions an image according to his own invention,

* Page 6. † Page 100, in the note.

admires

admires the figment of his fancy, expoſes it to public view, and then invites his readers to worſhip his GOLDEN CALF: we look up, to ſee if any ſalute it, when, lo! we behold the *Doctor* deſpiſing his own image, throwing it down to the ground, and gravely telling us, he does not wiſh that any ſuch idolatry may take place under the Britiſh Empire!

AFTER all you can ſay, *Britannicus*, on this ſubject, you muſt own, that the preſent armament, and the proſpect of an approaching carnage are truly alarming objects. They are, indeed, Sir: and ſo much do I prefer peace and purity to dominion and wealth, that as an unconnected individual, *Americus*, I had much rather the revolting coloniſts were abandoned, and left to lament at leiſure their own folly, than to hear of their being drenched in blood. Sanguinary meaſures, my friend, in no degree, are any more pleaſing to me than they are to you. But if, inſtead of making any honorable conceſſion, they continue to treat GREAT BRITAIN in the ſame ungrateful and contemptuous manner the Congreſs has of late, I ſuppoſe, whatever I and others wiſh, hoſtilities will not ceaſe: no, in all probability, they will be continued till we have *juſt*, and, I fear, *laſting* occaſion to lament the dreadful effects of ſuch civil diſſention. If the ties of *intereſt*, *honour*, and *affection*, will not bind us to each other, every other effort will be in vain!

THE END.

The moſt material Errata (except what appears deficient in the beginning of page 42) are the following:

Page Line

16. 14. *for* avaracious, *read* avaricious
18. 24. *for* liked to, *read* almoſt
43. at the bottom, *for* page 5, *read* page 4.
55. at the bottom, *for* page 20, *read* page 24.
61. line 8, *for* tired, *read* tried
68. in the firſt note, *for* page 48, *read* page 63.